United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/658,186	09/08/2000	Steven Metsker	05793.3041-00	3333
²²⁸⁵² 7590 04/30/2007 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			HAVAN, THU THAO	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WAGIIINGTO	WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4415		3691	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/658,186	METSKER ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Thu Thao Havan	3691			
The Period for Re	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
WHICHEV - Extensions of after SIX (6) - If NO period - Failure to rep Any reply rec	ENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. For reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period work within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, believed by the Office later than three months after the mailing at term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed I the mailing date of this communication. TO (35 U.S.C. & 133)			
Status			•			
2a)⊠ This 3)⊡ Since	ponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Fe</u> action is FINAL . 2b) This e this application is in condition for allowanted in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.				
Disposition of	Claims					
4a) O 5)∭ Clain 6)⊠ Clain 7)∭ Clain	n(s) <u>1-12,14-30,32-48 and 50-54</u> is/are per of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw n(s) is/are allowed. n(s) <u>1-12, 14-30, 32-48, and 50-54</u> is/are on n(s) is/are objected to. n(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Pa		·				
10)∏ The d Applic	pecification is objected to by the Examiner rawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acceptant may not request that any objection to the common state.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under	35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
· ·			•			
Attachment(s)			•			
2) Notice of Dra	ferences Cited (PTO-892) aftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) //Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 3691

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, and 50-54 are pending. This action is in response to the remarks received February 5, 2007.

Response to Arguments

The rejection of claims 1-12, 14-30, 32-48, and 50-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Gershman et al. (US 6,401,085) and Eggleston (US 6,061,660) is maintained.

Upon a closer examination, Applicant's arguments filed February 5, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the arguments concerning the previously rejected claims the following comments are made:

Applicant alleges that the prior art made of record fails to teach solicitations, url, and offer code. The examiner disagrees with applicant's representative since Eggleston teaches solicitations, url, and offer code in relation to incentive programs and award fulfillment (col. 13, line 43 to col. 14, line 5 (i.e. solicitations); col. 14, lines 6-19, col. 15, lines 26-59; figs. 1 (i.e. url) and 10-17; col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 8 (i.e. offering code)). For clarification, in figures 10-17, Eggleston displays a promotion sample having the consumers enter the code with an incentive promotion n. He discloses the code for the incentive program. In that, the sponsor database is updated to reflect the presence of the new incentive program, and the sponsor site is updated to include a link (i.e. url) to the new

Art Unit: 3691

incentive program. There are several ways in which the online code can be embedded into the website of the sponsoring firm such as the sponsoring firm may receive instructions on how to the place of HTML tags in desired locations throughout the site. The sponsor or the sponsor's webmaster could leave a port open through which the incentive firm could embed the code in designated areas. Thus, he discloses solicitations when he discloses incentive programs such as including advertising or product logos as part of the graphical object viewed by the consumer when playing an incentive program. Solicitation is the act of enticing a person to do something therefore the incentive program is an enticing program. As for the url, Eggleston teaches a sponsor initiates participation through the sponsor computer by accessing a web browser and entering the URL of the sponsor site. In addition, Eggleston teaches offer code when he discloses the offer promotions as explained above.

With regards to the claims rejected as taught by Gershman and Eggleston, the examiner would like to point out that the reference teaches the claimed limitations and thus provides adequate support for the claimed limitations. Therefore, the examiner maintains that Gershman and Eggleston taught the claimed limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3691

Claims **1-12**, **14-30**, **32-48**, and **50-54** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershman et al. (US 6,401,085) in view of Eggleston (US 6,061,660).

Re claims **1, 12, 16, 19, 30, 34, 37, 48,** and **52**, Gershman teaches a method for providing...web-based offers and receiving corresponding responses thereto (<u>col. 38, line 50</u> to col. 39, line 25: Gershman teaches solicitations when he discloses web sites that effectively attract customers in col. 39, line 14) comprising:

...a set of users sharing pre-selected characteristics...(<u>col. 37, line 55 to col. 38, line 50</u>);

receiving a request to access the web site...(figs. 10a-10b and 14-15);

providing, via the accessed web site, an offer to at least one of the users (<u>col. 40, lines</u> 4-67: <u>Gershman matches the product to the code</u>); and

receiving, via the accessed web site, a response to the offer from at least one of the users (col. 40, line 55 to col. 41, line 50; *Gershman discloses promotional products* according to the user's profile).

However, Gershman does not explicitly teach solicitations, url, and offer code. On the other hand, Eggleston discloses solicitations, url, and offer code in relation to incentive programs and award fulfillment (col. 13, line 43 to col. 14, line 5 (i.e. solicitations); col. 14, lines 6-19, col. 15, lines 26-59; figs. 1 (i.e. url) and 10; col. 1, line 63 to col. 2, line 8 (i.e. offering code)). He discloses solicitations when he discloses incentive programs such as including advertising or product logos as part of the graphical object viewed by the consumer when playing an incentive program. As for the url, Eggleston teaches a sponsor initiates participation through the sponsor computer by accessing a web browser and

Art Unit: 3691

entering the URL of the sponsor site. In addition, Eggleston teaches offer code when he discloses offer promotions. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include solicitations, url, and offer code in relation to incentive programs in an internet system to promote products as discloses in Eggleston.

Re claims **2, 20,** and **38**, Gershman teaches offer code incorporated in the solicitation is entered by the user at the web site (<u>figs. 1a, 9 (element 900, 910, and 950)</u>, and <u>25</u>).

Re claims **3, 21,** and **39**, Gershman teaches solicitation is sent through electronic means (<u>figs. 1a, 10a, 17, and 24</u>). *Gershman discloses solicitation of products through web site, which is an electronic means.*

Re claims **4, 22,** and **40**, Gershman teaches receiving a request further includes providing a customer identification number and using the customer identification number to verify a user (col. 41, line 51 to col. 42, line 3). *Gershman discloses a username and a password to identify a user.*

Re claims **5**, **23**, and **41**, Gershman teaches offer provides for adjusting existing customer account terms (col. 44, lines 49-65). Gershman permits customers to customize their accounts thus he permits a customer to adjust existing customer account terms.

Re claims **6**, **8**, **24**, and **42**, Gershman teaches offer includes terms for new customers (col. 41, lines 23-50; col. 43, lines 45-65).

Re claims **7, 25-26,** and **43-44**, Gershman teaches adjusting a customer's account terms based on the response (col. **47**, lines 32-65; figs. 19, 23, and 25).

Re claims **9, 27,** and **45**, Gershman teaches saving a user's access history (<u>col. 11, lines 49-62; col. 40, lines 9-16; col. 47, lines 43-52).</u>

Art Unit: 3691

Re claims **10**, **28**, and **46**, Gershman teaches analyzing the user's access history and modifying the offer based on the analysis (<u>col. 12</u>, <u>lines 46-59</u>; <u>col. 40</u>, <u>lines 9-16</u>).

Re claims **11, 29**, and **47**, Gershman teaches a customer's account is automatically updated based on the response (<u>col. 48</u>, <u>lines 15-32</u>).

Re claims **14**, **17**, **32**, **35**, **50**, and **53**, Gershman teaches set of offers relate to at least one of cellular telephone products and services (col. 38, lines 65-67; figs. 9 and 16).

Gershman discloses any type of products and services thus a cellular telephone is a type of product.

Re claims **15**, **18**, **33**, **36**, **51**, and **54**, Gershman teaches set of offers relate to financial services (col. 38, lines 57-62). *Gershman discloses financial planning.*

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3691

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu Thao Havan whose telephone number is (571) 272-8111. The examiner can normally be reached during her flexitime schedule.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct-uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

TTH 4/25/07

> ALEXANDER KALINOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Altander dalenor